

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. 37.---No. 13.] LONDON, SATURDAY, OCT. 14, 1820. [Price, 6d.

TO THE

ATTORNEY GENERAL,

*On the Evidence, as compared
with the assertions in his
opening Speech.*

London, Oct. 11, 1820.

ATTORNEY GENERAL,

It is now not a question of the Queen's *guilt*, or *innocence*; but a question of *conspiracy*; and the great object with the public is, to ascertain the parties to that conspiracy, and especially those with whom this second conspiracy *originated*. The little under-affair, just exposed at *Bow Street*, of which I shall take notice by-and-by, serves to show, that nothing has been neglected on the part of the Queen's and the People's enemies; and, now we may daily expect new disclosures to be made. A rent has been made in this garment of imposture, and, it will now go to pieces like a cobweb.

But, at present, it is my business to make some remarks on the *evidence* that has been given, and to compare that evidence with the assertions in your *opening Speech*. To that Speech I published an answer as soon as it came forth. That answer convinced everyone who read it, that the charges were *false*. Because it clearly showed, that to believe the charges, we must of necessity set *reason* and *nature* at defiance. It was, in that answer, clearly shown, that the great ground of presumed guilt, namely, the *power of Bergami over the Queen*, was false; that it never had an existence; that notorious facts proved it to be atrociously false; and, the conclusion was, that the charges, founded on such ground, were also false. It was shown, that, if such *power* had existed, Bergami would have kept the thirty-five thousand a year; and, that it is out of nature to believe, that, if he had possessed such power, he would ever have permitted the Queen to come and

run the *risk* of losing all, and all he must have expected her to lose, if the alledged intercourse had existed, of which existence he *must* have been well assured; and assured, too, *that there were witnesses to prove it.*

The evidence, and your failure to prove, even by your own witnesses, many things that you promised to prove, calls on me for another general observation or two, before I enter on the particular falsehoods contained in your opening Speech.

The adulterous intercourse was, you said, *continued* from November 1814 to the time that *Bergami* quitted the service of the Queen. Now, we know, that he quitted it in June, 1820, at St. Omers. None of your evidence comes down later than 1817! Your own evidence will bring you down no lower. Then it was *false* to say that you would show the *six years'* continuation. Why you did *not* is clear enough. There were to be found no *turned-off servants*, who had lived with the Queen *after* 1817! The *Majocchi*, *Demonts* and *Sacchinis* had been packed off; and the *Pola-*
cre-men had been discharged *before* this period! You could

find, or, rather *Cook*, *Powell*, *Brown* and the rest of the band could find nobody that the Queen had turned off, or that *Bergami* had quarrelled with, *after* that period!

To account for this, Street, of the *Courier* (and to name Street is quite enough), has told us, in a demi-official form, that we are not to believe, that the adulterous intercourse had had no existence because it *ceased*; for, that "it is a long lane that has *no turn*." You said that you would prove the continuation throughout the *six years*. But, no matter. The Queen was *forty-six* years old, when the intercourse ascribed to her commenced; and she was *forty-nine* when it ended. To *believe* this, what sort of a man must you be? To believe that a woman, who had been so fond of a comparatively young man for three whole years; who had been toying with him all day, and sleeping with him every night; should cease her fondness all at once, and become chaste as a nun at *forty-nine*; to *believe* this, what sort of a man must you be! But, there is, in this case, something more for you to believe than even this. I do not know what sort of a

man you may be: I have never seen you, and I hope and trust I never shall. You may be made of common flesh and blood; you may have the outward appearance and inward feelings of other mortals; or, you may, like the old woman and maid, described by the Copper Captain, be "covered with a husk, "or shell, and rattle like a "dried chesnut;" but, if you be made of flesh and blood and bones and bowels, what a stout believer must you be, to believe, that the Queen, having, whether from *satiety* or from *repentance*, discontinued her enjoyments, would *still have kept Bergami in her service and about her person?* Can any man, not absolutely made up of dry stuff, or surrounded with a husk or shell, possibly believe this?

What the judges of the Queen may be made of I shall not presume even to guess. Their blood, which is generally called *high*, may bear some resemblance to that of the Angels, as described by Milton. But, this I know, that to common mortals the sight, even the *bare sight*, of a once-enjoyed and now-indifferent and no-longer-loved or enjoyed object, is never endured

but from hard and irresistible necessity; and, we well know, that, in this case, it was endured *by choice*, if your allegations be true. Any thing so completely against nature never was heard of before in the world.

On the other hand, suppose the intercourse to have continued till Bergami quitted the Queen, and that it was mere accident, lucky accident, that preserved her Majesty against the ferretings of Cook, Powell, and Brown, as to periods after 1817; supposing you to take this ground, what a man you must be to believe, that Bergami would have been brought to *St. Omers*, to take his last leave in the presence of *Mr. Alderman Wood, Lady Anne Hamilton, and many others!* Here was a woman of *fifty-two*, doating upon a comparatively young man, sunk into a life of indulgence with him, constant to him as the dove to her mate, saying "all for love; or, the world well lost," drawing towards the moment of tearing herself from him, and (oh, monstrous!) *choosing to bid him an everlasting adieu in the presence of a score of people!* To be covered with a husk or shell is absolutely necessary to your believing of this.

Not only was the parting wholly unnecessary to secure the future guilty enjoyments of the Queen; not only was she going from the certainty of enjoying fifty thousand a year and her paramour; not only was she, without the smallest necessity, going to encounter the risk of losing the income, the lover and her life, as she then thought, in a struggle against this tremendous government; not only was she doing all this, but she must *choose* to bring the adored object to St. Omers to take the last look at his beloved person, to hear the last sound of his dear voice, in the presence of a score of witnesses! It must, indeed, be more than a husk, or shell, that would make a man believe this. Against the voice of nature, speaking to all our hearts here, the swearings of ten thousand witnesses, be they who or what they may, are not worth a straw; and, when the witnesses are such as you have produced, what does their evidence amount to other than proof of a deep-laid conspiracy?

I now come to particular parts of your statement; and, let it be observed, that this statement was sent forth, all over the world, two months before any

evidence could possibly be offered in contradiction to it. I begin with your monstrous assertion about the *Leone's exhibitions*. I have twice mentioned this before; but, you never shall hear the last of this as long as you have a head upon your shoulders. Your assertion was this:

“ On the return of the Princess from the East, she brought in her train a man named Leone, of the most brutal and depraved manners. This person used to exhibit himself at the Villa Branchi in the most indecorous and *shameful manner*, the Princess and Bergami being present. The circumstances are *so shocking, so disgusting to the mind*, that I cannot *without difficulty bring myself to mention them to your Lordships. But it is necessary. The painful situation in which I am placed*, requires that I should make your Lordships understand the nature of the disgusting exhibition, which shall appear by the testimony of various witnesses. This man, in the situation I described, amongst other things, used to *imitate, in the most indelicate manner, the sexual intercourse* before the servants, and in the presence of the Princess.”

The whole nation, with the exception of the *detested classes*, exclaimed, the moment they heard this charge, “ it is a lie!”

A lie it has proved to be, and that, odious and detestable in proportion to the malignity that suggested it, and that alone could have suggested it. Your own swearers call the exhibition only a *buffoonery*; and, Sir WILLIAM GELL, who saw it, says it was very much like some of the dances *on our own stage*, and that it is a thing publicly exhibited, before all sorts of people, "in every town from *Madrid to China*." What a lie was this, then, to send over the world! How are you to justify this conduct? But, of *that* I have more to say by-and-by; for, you will find, I fancy, that there must *now* be responsibility found *somewhere*.

I shall now go back to the outset of your string of accusations against the Queen; and, as you here take great pains to represent Bergami in *as low* a light as possible, I shall here, once for all, notice this circumstance of his *sudden elevation*, a circumstance on which you build so much. You say, that he was *received* into her service, clearly leaving it to be supposed, that she had *got him into her service* for those purposes which you were about to describe. You next call him a "*courier*,

footman, or *valet de place*;" and this with the evident intention of causing it to be believed that he had always been a mere footman, and looked upon by gentlemen in Italy as a footman is looked upon by gentlemen in England. This is a string that you continually harp upon, from one end to the other of your canting and spiteful narrative. And, when you come to speak of the *promotion* of Bergami, you recur incessantly to the low state, in which the Queen found him.

Now, in the first place, Bergami never was a footman; the place of courier is very different indeed from that of a footman; he had been in the army; his rank was on a level with that of our quarter-masters of horse; he was much respected by the Generals with whom he served; and, it is proved, that those Generals made him, on certain occasions, a companion, and always honoured him with their confidence. Secondly, it is proved by Sir William Gell, Mr. Craven, and Sicard, that he was actually taken into the Queen's service *without her knowing any thing of the matter*. A Marquis recommended him to Mr. Craven; Mr. Craven saw

this Marquis salute him as equals salute; he was recommended to Mr. Craven in the strongest terms; and, thereupon, Sicard hired him as a courier for the Queen; and, upon an understanding, too, that he *was to be promoted*. In time his own great merits caused his promotion. He, as it clearly appears from the evidence, was a person of great merit; that he was an able, active, vigilant, and brave man; that, in all probability, the Queen owed her personal safety, in a great degree, to him; and that to promote such a man, to confide in him, to give him authority and to decorate him with honours, was a mark of wisdom as well as of justice in her Majesty.

But, why all this fuss about the *low* (as it is called) *origin* of Bergami? The old haughty Bourbons have made shift to swallow the pill of acknowledging as *Counts*, and *Dukes*, and *Princes*, as *Peers of France*, men who were *private soldiers* only a few years before they became *Dukes*, *Counts*, and *Princes*. The thrice treble-distilled haughtiness of the House of Austria (the prime protectress of *Social Order*), could come down to give its heiress, or eldest daughter,

to the "*Corsican Adventurer*." Nay, the King of Sweden himself, our King's brother-king and his *high* ally, was, only a few years before he became King, a *private soldier*. Why such a fuss, then, about the Baron's *low origin*? Why such efforts to make out, that his office in the army was *not higher* than that of a *serjeant*? Those who have made such efforts do not seem to know much of what is passing in the world; if they did, they would perceive that the low (as it is called) origin of the Baron is, with the public, a strong circumstance in his favour. They would perceive that the people, in spite of the Dungeon Bill and the Six Acts, have been *peeping* and prying a good deal into things; and that they now know perfectly well how to set a *just* value on what is *Nobility*, or *high-blood*. In short they would perceive that, as her Majesty has well observed, the age of darkness, delusion, and blind submission is gone, never to return.

However, I am disposed to allow that the Queen might, in her promotion of Bergami, be influenced by some motives besides those arising out of his

actual *services* to her. She might contract a great liking towards him. I can see no sin in her liking his manners and his person, and in her being pleased with his conversation and his company. Nay (and now I shall make your husk, if you have one, rattle), I can see no sin in her *loving him*! What! has it never occurred to a woman to become, by degrees, very fond of a man, with whom she never even thought of an adulterous intercourse? If this be *sin*, God have mercy on the sex! But, the Baron had a *wife*. Is it a sin, then, for a woman to be *pleased* with another woman's husband? Is it a sin for her to wish that he was not married? Is it a sin for her to *like him more than any other man*, and to bestow on him money or honours? Is this a proof of *guilt*? Is this a proof of her having a carnal intercourse with him? But, the Queen had a *husband*. That, to be sure, was a thumping consideration! Take, then, *diabolis regis*, and make the most of it! Bawl away, as long as you like, on the *duty* and *exclusive affection* that the Queen owed to her kind, tender, constant and loving husband.

There might be something very pleasing in the manners of Bergami; and, indeed, Sir William Gell repeatedly says, that he was remarkably *attentive* and *obliging*. He has this remarkable expression; that his manners were like those of an English gentleman, only *he was more attentive*! It is not likely that he would be less attentive to the Queen than to other persons. She who had been used, for so long a time, to harsh, coarse, and even brutal treatment, committed no sin in being pleased with this attention. Her own amiable, kind, benevolent, and affable manners, which have endeared every one to her, who has had the happiness to serve under her, and who has not been a monster of ingratitude; these manners were well calculated to inspire such a man as Bergami with zeal in her service, and to draw from him, in the various perilous situations in which the Queen was placed, numerous proofs of sincere and ardent feeling for her, and of devotion to her. And, was she to be insensible to all this? Was she to lock up her heart, and have no feeling, except for her dear spouse in Pall-Mall? Was she to banish, for

his sake, even gratitude from her bosom? Was she to spurn at attempts to please her? Was she to repay sincere attachment with scorn, and reserve all her smiles and her money to be bestowed on those *haughty* and *greedy* creatures, who slandered and treated her with contempt, while they were ever ready to pocket her money?

LORD GUILDFORD says, indeed, that *he* saw nothing particularly indicative of *good-breeding* about Bergami. But, different people see with different *eyes*. Women are very sharp-sighted in discovering merit, or demerit, in men. The Queen was a much better judge in choosing a Chamberlain than Lord Guildford could be, though that noble Peer has, even from a boy, been a *Chamberlain himself*; and though, as a Chamberlain of the *Exchequer*, he has actually received about *seventy thousand pounds of public money*. If the Baron had been acquainted with this fact, he might have called the noble Peer his *brother Chamberlain*. During the time that her Majesty has belonged to us, she has cost the country less a year, than has been received yearly, from tax and church

revenues, by Lord Guildford and his family. They, doubtless, have *merited* all this, though every one may not be able to say *for what*. But, surely, then, Bergami, who was so long in attendance upon the Queen, who accompanied her in so many fatiguing travels and voyages, and who was, in fact, her *guard* and *protector* against highwaymen, assassins, and deadly foes of all sorts, merited some compensation, some favour at her hands!

But, the Queen took his brothers and sisters into her employ. Nothing more natural, or more consistent with an absence from guilt. They were all in *efficient offices*; one attended to one thing, and another to another. It was natural for Bergami to get his relations employed, and it was perfectly natural for the Queen to wish to have faithful people about her. Much stress has been laid on the *wife* not being in the Queen's service; and, on a circumstance so perfectly natural, the basest insinuations have been attempted to be founded. Now, I put it to any impartial man, whether the reasons for this exclusion are not manifest, without resorting to

any particular circumstances, though such might also have existed. Bergami was the chief ruler of the servants of all degrees. If the wife had been in the house, who does not see, that she would naturally have taken on her a sort of *command*, as *mistress*? Who does not see that there would, from this cause, naturally have arisen *eternal feuds*, in an establishment like that of the Queen, who had, at some times, from forty to sixty persons in her household? In such an establishment there must be a species of order and command kept up, approaching somewhat towards military discipline, and, what pretty uproars must there have been with a wife *continually interfering* in this discipline, which she to a certainty would, or the husband and wife would have lived like cat and dog. Besides, the wife of the Baron was liable to the trifling accidents of pregnancy and lying-in! Would not those have interfered with the comfort of the establishment? However, though here is more than sufficient to account for the exclusion, which was, for these reasons, absolutely necessary, let me ask whether the exclusion of

the *wife* was not agreeable to the *invariable practice in similar cases*? What great farmer, who has a married bailiff, takes his wife too? What gentleman, or *lady*, who has a married cook, or house-steward, or butler, has the *wife too* in the house? Is there one single instance of this in the nation? But, to come more closely to the point, did the late Queen, even after the confinement of the King, take the *wives* of her Chamberlains, Masters of Horse, Gentlemen Ushers, and the like, *into her house*? Did she have these gentlemen's *wives* there to intermeddle in the duties of the husbands, and in some sort to participate in her own authority? Did she have her Chamberlains wives to *lye-in* under her roof? Did she, in order that the dear doves of spouses might never be apart, encumber herself with the racket of *accoucheurs*, *nurses*, and all the babble of the nursery? You know, and all the world knows, she never did, and that she would have been a monstrous fool if she had; but why, then, impute to Queen Caroline as proof of an adulterous intercourse, a practice invariably followed by her predecessor,

whom the accusers of her present Majesty represent as a paragon of purity and chastity !

Here, then, is an answer, and more than an answer, to all the insinuations relative to the exclusion of the wife ; and more than a refutation of all the base conclusions attempted to be drawn from that circumstance. Her Majesty had had, besides, some *experience* as to that domestic curse, a *husband and wife for inmates*. She had had *Sir John Douglas and his wife* ! She had known what it was to have this joint authority in her house. She had, at last, found herself *compelled to get them out of her house*, or to run away from it herself. The result was, that they, who had made her life miserable with their everlasting wranglings and sulkings with one another, joined most lovingly in a plot to destroy her. Surely this was enough, if plain reason and the practice of the world had not been enough, to deter her from having another man and wife in the management of her household.

You asserted, over and over again, that Bergami's sister, the Countess Oldi, was " a person without education, and of the most low and vulgar manners."

On this assumed fact you found the assertion, that the Queen having made this lady her *companion*, was a circumstance tending to prove the existence of an *adulterous intercourse with the brother*.

The assertion as to want of education and as to vulgarity of manners having been proved to be *false* by the concurrent testimony of Mr. CRAVEN, SIR W GELL, Mr. MILLS, and even by the NOBLE CHAMBERLAIN OF OUR EXCHEQUER, it is not necessary to say a word as to the calumnious conclusion which you drew from the assertion ; but, we have here an excellent opportunity of showing the sort of trifles that have been caught at, and the indescribable anxiety to establish even those trifles. The matter was pushed, at last, even to the *accent* of the Countess Oldi ! Her accent was to be the test of her *education* ! Some very *high* people would, I believe, not stand such a test. I remember an impudent, old, broad-faced baggage, who was, for many years, the centre of corruption, and who had the audacity to crack her fan in triumph every time any Peer said, "*not guilty*," on the trial of the late Melville ; I remem-

ber this insolent old haridan, whose accent was no more *English* than it was French. But, indeed, what have we to do but to listen to any one debate, in either house of parliament, to be convinced of the impudence, the baseness, and the beastliness, of inferring want of *education* from *provincial accent*? According to this, nobody can, in this kingdom, be well educated, unless bred up within fifty miles of London. I will not mention the *cramp* of the Scotch and the *blub-blub* of the Irish, for there is LORD GRENVILLE, who could not say *whole* if his life depended upon it. He invariably says *hull*, the "*hull* of the subject," with his mouth open and his tongue decked up against the inside of his upper teeth, and not "*whole*," with his lips pushed forward and his mouth nearly closed. But, what is this a proof of? Not of *want of education*; but of having been born and brought up in Buckinghamshire. There is the Lord Chancellor, who has been from his parental coal-merchant's fire-side for *fifty years*; who has been a tutor at Oxford, and who has made, perhaps, a million of money *by talking*, but who still

has the *burr* in *his* throat, and whose accent is not even yet half so good as that of an apprentice-boy, born and brought up, in Kent, or Surrey.

What a foolish thing is it, what a *catching at straws* is it, to attempt to draw from any provincial *accent* of the Countess Oldi, an inference unfavourable to the innocence of the Queen! It was asked, whether the Countess spoke Italian *grammatically*. An *illustration* was wanted here; and, if I had been Counsel for the Queen, I would have read an extract from the King's last Speech, then an extract from the Answer to it given by the House of Commons; and, then I would have asked the witness, whether the language of the Countess Oldi were more or less *grammatical* than those compositions! However, since grammar is to have something to do in the decision, I will insert these two extracts here:

LAST SENTENCE OF KING'S SPEECH. — "I trust that an awakened sense of the dangers which they have incurred, and of the arts which have been employed to seduce them, will bring back by far the greater part of those who have been unhappily led astray, and will revive in them

“ that spirit of loyalty, that due
 “ submission to the laws, and
 “ that attachment to the Consti-
 “ tion, which SUBSISTS un-
 “ abated in the hearts of the
 “ great body of the people, and
 “ which, under the blessings of
 “ Divine Providence, HAVE se-
 “ cured to the British nation the
 “ enjoyment of a larger share
 “ of practical freedom, as well
 “ as of prosperity and happi-
 “ ness, than have fallen to the
 “ lot of any nation in the world.”

ANSWER OF THE COMMONS.
 —“ We concur most heartily in
 “ the benevolent WISH, ex-
 “ pressed by your Majesty, that
 “ an awakened sense of the
 “ dangers which they have in-
 “ curred, and of the arts which
 “ have been employed to seduce
 “ them, WILL bring back the
 “ far greater proportion of those
 “ who have been unhappily led
 “ astray, and WILL revive in
 “ them that spirit of loyalty,
 “ that due submission to the
 “ laws, and that attachment to
 “ the Constitution, which we are
 “ confident SUBSISTS in the
 “ hearts of the great body of
 “ the people, which, under the
 “ blessings of Divine Provi-
 “ dence, HAS secured to the
 “ British nation the enjoyment
 “ of a larger share of practical
 “ freedom, as well as of prospe-
 “ rity and happiness, than HAS
 “ fallen to the lot of any nation
 “ in the world.”

Now, then, if *grammar like*
this be to be found in things
 proceeding from the mouths;
 nay, from the *pens*, of our *Mi-*
nisters and *Legislators*; if

language like this be, and on
 such an occasion too, used by
 the *very elect* of the “*first*
 “*society in the world*,” by
 “*the ornament of the country* ;”
 if this be the case, let not our
 good and gracious and benevo-
 lent and gallant Queen be car-
 ped at, even if the Countess of
 Oldi should be found tripping
 upon a point of *grammar* !

In dismissing this at once
 childish and spiteful tissue of in-
 sinuations built on the assertions
 about low-birth and vulgarity, I,
 if I had been Counsel for the
 Queen, would have asked the
 witnesses, whether any of the
 males of the family of Bergami
 were “*wine-tasters, butlers,*
 “*tide-waiters, craners, wharf-*
 “*ingers, gaugers, or pack-*
 “*ers* ;” and whether any of the
 ladies of the family were
 “*clerks, ushers, custom-house-*
 “*keepers or sweepers of Malls.*”
 Any man with a husk, or shell,
 about him, might have rustled at
 this, and I might have set high-
 blood into a strong fermenta-
 tion ; but, if I had been Coun-
 sel for the Queen, the Devil take
 me, if I would not have put the
 question ; for, whether the
 witnesses had answered in the
 affirmative or in the negative, I
 should, in my summing up, have

known well how to make precious use of this part of their evidence. The plan of the Queen's Lawyers seems to be *purely defensive*: her Majesty, happily for herself and the country, has pursued a plan *wholly different*.

Having now swept away all the contemptible rubbish about low-birth and vulgarity; having shown that the Queen's conduct with regard to Bergami and his family was perfectly consistent with innocence in her Majesty's demeanour and intentions; having shown how hollow that cause must be that could seek for aid in such pitiful pretences. I now come to your more direct grounds of charge, beginning, as you began, with the distribution of the sleeping rooms at Naples, in November, 1817.

The passage of your speech relating to this matter is as follows:—

“Up to the time of Her Majesty's arrival at Naples, this lad (Wm. Austin) was the object of her peculiar attention, and, in fact, being a boy of only 6 or 7 years of age, was in the habit of sleeping in a bed in the same room with her Majesty. The arrangement of her Majesty's own sleeping apartment devolved upon one servant, whose peculiar duty it was to attend to that branch

of her domestic comfort. On the arrival of her Majesty's suite at Naples, it was so arranged that her Majesty's sleeping-room was at an opposite side of the house to that of her menial domestics, among whom was her courier. On the first night of her Majesty's arrival at Naples, (the 8th Nov.) to which he had called their lordships' attention, this arrangement was continued. Bergami slept in that part of the house which had been prepared for the domestics, and young Austin slept in her Majesty's apartment. But on the following morning, November the 9th, the servants of the establishment learned with some surprise, because no reason appeared to them for the change, that Bergami was no longer to sleep in that part of the house where he had slept the night preceding; but that it was her Majesty's pleasure that he should sleep in a room from which there was a free communication with that of her Majesty, by means of a corridor or passage. He need not state, that such a circumstance was calculated to excite the surprise of those who were about her Majesty's person; and that surprise was increased when they learnt from her Majesty that she no longer wished Wm. Austin to continue to sleep in her room. For this she assigned a reason, which, if it was her only motive, was very proper; she said that he had now arrived at an age when it was no

"longer becoming that he
 "should sleep in her apartment;
 "and a separate room was pre-
 "pared for his use. He had al-
 "ready stated that, from the
 "situation assigned to Bergami,
 "a free communication was
 "open between his chamber and
 "that of her Majesty; and (he
 "believed) he should be able to
 "satisfy their lordships that on
 "the evening of the 9th of No-
 "vember that intercourse,
 "which is charged between her
 "Majesty and Bergami by the
 "present bill, commenced, and
 "that it was continued from
 "that time till he quitted her
 "service. Upon the evening of
 "the 9th of November her Ma-
 "jesty went to the Opera at
 "Naples, but it was observed
 "that she returned home at a
 "very early hour. The person
 "who waited upon her, on her
 "return, was the maid servant
 "whose duty it was particularly
 "to attend to her bed-room. She
 "was struck with the manner
 "of the Princess, and with the
 "agitation which she manifest-
 "ed. She hastened to her
 "apartment, and gave strict
 "orders that Wm. Austin
 "should not be admitted to her
 "room that evening. She was
 "then observed to go from her
 "own room towards that as-
 "signed to Bergami. She very
 "soon dismissed her female at-
 "tendant, telling her that she
 "had no further occasion for
 "her services. The female ser-
 "vant retired; but not without
 "those suspicions which the
 "circumstances he had mention-
 "ed were calculated to excite
 "in the mind of any individual.

"She knew, at the time, that
 "*Bergami was in his bed-room,*
 "for this was the first night of
 "*his having taken advantage*
 "*of the arrangement which had*
 "*been previously made."*

Now, here is the outset; here
 is the foundation; here is the
 laying of the ground for all
 that follows. Every word of
 this passage is of importance.
 Here, as described by you, is a
 regular plan begun to be put
 into execution. All the circum-
 stances, which are numerous, are
 made nicely to fit with each
 other. It is a contrivance as
 complete as ever proceeded
 from the mind of man. Now,
 then, if, in every part of it, this
 statement of yours is proved to
 be false, who is to believe any
 thing that you asserted, and that
 your witnesses have sworn?
 Let us see, then, how the mat-
 ter stands.

First, you state the age of
 Mr. Austin falsely, "a boy only
 "six or seven years old." He
 was born in 1802, and was,
 therefore, about twelve years
 old. This, therefore, was a di-
 rect falsehood, and intended to
 answer a malignant purpose. If
 he were only six or seven, the
 removal of him from the Queen's
 room could not be for the sake
 of delicacy, and might well be

for the sake of *concealment*. But, if he were *twelve* years old, the motive of delicacy would naturally enough exist. Therefore, you represent him as *six* or *seven* years old instead of *twelve*, in order to produce a belief, that the removal must have been for the *sole purpose of concealment*! You said, that you received your *instructions* from the *Home-Office*. You have frequently said, during the trial, that you appear before the Lords by their *command*. Now, pray, who was it that *instructed* or *commanded* you to represent Mr. Austin as being "a boy only *six* or *seven* years old?" If you do not answer me, I trust that you will answer this question before this matter is ended.

You say, that this boy was in the *habit of sleeping in the same room with the Queen before this night*; this *guilty night*. It is now proved, over and over again, that he had frequently *slept in another room* than the Queen's before this time; and, it is also proved, that, *before this time*, she had *settled* on his quitting her room for good. But, from your representation we are to infer, that she now, *for the first time*, thought of putting him into another room; and,

being, as you asserted, "only *six* or *seven* years old," you left all the world to conclude, that she now put him out of her room for the sole purpose of concealing the adulterous intercourse on which she was about to enter.

Next comes the contrivance, the deep-laid contrivance, to get access to Bergami by night. And this is your statement: first, that, on the arrival at Naples, "the Queen's sleeping room was at an *opposite side of the house* to that of the menial domestics, amongst whom was Bergami; that he slept there the *first night*, but that the next day, to the *surprize* of the servants of the establishment, *they found*, that Bergami was *no longer* to sleep in that part of the house, but that it was her *Majesty's pleasure*, that he should sleep in a room, from which there was a *free communication with that of her Majesty* by means of a passage." Let me stop here; for the vile misrepresentations will accumulate so fast, that they will defy all power of exposure.

It is proved by SICARD, and we shall by-and-by see, this is a witness that nothing can

shake ; that this is a double-distilled lie. He says, that the house at Naples was found inconvenient ; and that after the first night, *several alterations as to bed-rooms were made*. He says, that Bergami, who had slept the first night, in a room over Lady E. Forbes, was brought and lodged in a small room *in that part of the house where the Queen slept* ; but, he does not, like you, say, that this change was in consequence of "*Her Majesty's pleasure*."

No ! so far from it, he says, that it was *he made the change of his own head* ; and, that he made it, too, not only without any orders, but *without consulting with the Queen, and without her knowledge* ! Alas ! how your tissue, your neatly woven web of falsehoods, is torn to atoms by this single touch of the finger of truth ! What now becomes of all that "*surprise*," which you say was felt by the *servants of the establishment*, when they found that Bergami was to change his quarters ? This SICARD was *one of those very servants* !

But, SICARD does not stop here. He goes further, and shows *why* he made the change with regard to Bergami. He

says, that, *near the little place where Bergami was put to sleep, there was a door from the garden* ; and, that it was thought *necessary* by him, SICARD, and also by another servant, HIERONIMUS, that *some one should be placed to sleep there, to prevent robbers from entering by that door* ! Now, what baseness was it, then, to assert, or to instruct you to assert, that Bergami was placed here expressly by desire of the Queen, and for the purpose alleged by you !

Then, as to the *free communication* between Bergami's closet and the chamber of the Queen. Who would not imagine, that she had got his room *as near to her's as possible*, and that there was *nobody sleeping in any rooms between them* ? Yet this was wholly false. His room was at *sixty feet* from her's along the main passage ; there were three sleeping rooms between them, all occupied, one by Mr. Austin, one by Hieronimus, and one by Doctor Holland ! There was a communication between their rooms by a *back passage* ; but, then, two doors opened into that passage from the other and there were two doors to open to get to Bergami's room from the room of the Queen !

Never were more flagrant or baser falsehoods than those here exposed by SICARD.

Next we come to William Austin again. And, now mind, you say, that his removal took place on the 9th of November, the *second* night of the residence at Naples. The Queen then gave "*strict orders*," that Austin should "*not be admitted to her room that evening!*" SICARD says, that it might be about *a week* after the arrival at Naples that the removal took place!

You say, that, when the Queen went to bed, *she knew* that Bergami was in his room, "*for this was the first night of his having taken advantage of that arrangement.*" *Advantage*, indeed! Would it not have been more honest for you to say, that, night being come, bed-time having arrived, he had gone to the room appointed for him to sleep in by SICARD!

How infamous is all this! But, your employers did not know of what SICARD has now told you. WHY DID THEY NOT KNOW IT? This is a question that your employers will have put home to them *by-and-by*. —WHY DID THEY NOT KNOW WHAT SICARD HAS

NOW TOLD THEM, before they spent *three hundred thousand pounds* in a prosecution of the Queen? SICARD was in England. He has been here these *three or four years*. Dr. HOLLAND has been here these *five years*. And yet, they have never been *spoken to* by your employers! Never even *spoken to*! Did this discover a desire to come at *truth*; or, did it discover a desire to have, at last, an *excuse* for having acted upon *falsehood*? This is the point of all points. Your employers were not bound to believe SICARD or Dr. HOLLAND; but, they were bound to *question them*, before they undertook to accuse and *asperse* the Queen. Their not having done this *proves* clearly what their views, wishes, and intentions were. Can anybody say; can even your employers say, that they would have brought the accusations forward, if they had, before they brought them forward, heard SICARD? Why, then, *did they not hear him*? They knew he was in England; they knew, that he was *not very well pleased with the Queen*; they knew, that he had been, in fact, kindly put on the shelf; but, yet they *feared* to hear him! He was a man

naturalized in England; a man of excellent character; he was not a Cook and Powell and Brown man; he was not a Majocchi, a Sacchini, or a Demont; and, therefore, it was, that they *did not speak to him.*

This point is now of much more importance than your whole day's cross-examination of Mr. HOWNAM, or your three quarter of a day's cross-examination of the half-suffocated Mr. FLINN: yes, of a vast deal more consequence than whether the binnacle of the polacre was round or square, flat or sloping, covered with lead or covered with copper, or whether it was flat at the top, or formed an inclined plane. You may bother as long as you please about a man and woman sleeping under a *tent*, which in fact covered nearly the whole quarter-deck of the ship, had a gang-way going down through it, and was no more a place of secrecy than a barrack-room is a place of secrecy; you may try to bother

and bewilder, and make out a something at last that may seem to form a plausible ground for this proceeding, and to show that the instigators were not animated by unmixed malice aforethought; but, after all this more than infernal persecution, her Majesty is not to be shuffled off without the prosecutors being able to prove, that they availed themselves of all the means within their power of obtaining true information, or without their being made responsible for their not having so availed themselves. We know well that men are punished, and justly punished, too, for preferring false and groundless bills of indictment; and your employers may be well assured, that her Majesty is not to be shuffled off with any miserable pretences about *misinformation!*

I shall, in my next, follow you on through your other assertions. At present I must bestow some room on the *Pla-*

card Conspiracy. In the mean time you may depend upon it that it is impossible *for this wind to blow over!* It must bring down something or somebody; and, take this to your comfort, that you have raised it yourselves.

WM. COBBETT.

PLACARD CONSPIRACY.

This conspiracy is a very pretty companion piece to the Cato-street conspiracy. It makes naturally a part of the spy system, openly avowed by Canning, and as openly defended by Mr. Brougham, at the very time when he knew the Queen to be beset by spies, and also at the very time when he was preparing for his trip to St. Omers; or, rather, at the very moment when he was negotiating with the ministers the terms upon which the Queen was to be kept out of England. There are some men soft enough to be taken in by a little bombast; and the Queen is so popular; so justly beloved and admired, that there are men found to say, that this defence of the spy system, on the part of Mr. Brougham, may be overlooked for the pre-

sent. I am of a different opinion. The man that could openly defend that system was too far gone in political wickedness ever to retrace his steps. It was a thing that showed clearly that the man who did it was under the restraint of no principle whatever.

However, sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. The reader will judge from the following account of the proceedings at Bow-street and at the Home Office, of the nature and extent of the placarding conspiracy. I have inserted at the bottom of it, a letter from Mr. DENIS O'BRYEN. I suspect, and I have always suspected, that the Radicals had no hand whatever in the proclamation, which finally led to the recent beheadings and transportings in *Scotland!* I watched narrowly to see, whether any *printer, publisher, or bill-sticker* was detected in that affair! Not one! How could this have happened, if the Radicals had been the authors and promulgators of the proclamation? Oh! let but the blood of those brave Scotsmen be brought fairly home, and laid upon the heads of conspirators in London! Let this

be done, and we shall then see our way clear!

The intention of the conspirators upon the present occasion seems to have been, to produce what, in their bloody slang, is called a *premature movement*; and thereby to obtain a *re-action*, as they call it. They have been waiting for a *re-action* from the moment that the Queen arrived in London. They now see that there is no hope of a bloodless re-action; and, therefore, they are for creating some pretence, some excuse, something or other that shall justify a suspension of the laws, a creating of a hub bub, in the midst of which, the people may be frightened from their support of the Queen.

There had been, for many days, a rumour on float, that the Queen was to be taken up for *sedition* or *treason*, and COMMITTED TO THE TOWER! This rumour was on float for many days before the conspiracy was discovered. The discovery of the conspiracy; or, rather, the nature of the placards, and particularly of one, which, as I hear, was forthcom-

ing, is a very satisfactory commentary on this rumour. Conspirators are not always the wisest men in the world; and, therefore, we are not to conclude, that the checking of the conspiracy ought not to be hailed by themselves as a most lucky accident. Their premature movement might possibly have been a very unlucky movement for them; and, the taking of the Queen to the Tower is, I imagine, a thing much more easy to talk about than to perform. It is very certain that those who have brought the Queen to trial, would never have attempted such a thing, if they had known what they now know. Not to have begun the thing at all would have been best. To have stopped at any given stage of the proceedings would have been better than to go on, just as it would have been in the proceedings of the Boroughmongers against the Reformers. But, men, with power of dubious duration in their hands, are like a losing gamester with money in his pocket: neither of them ever stops till the last stake is gone.

I shall now insert the Bow-street proceedings and Mr. O'Bryen's letter, with this observation only, that the reader ought to look very attentively at the conduct of *Baker* the Bow-street magistrate, and at that of *Williams* his old acquaintance and friend. The reader should look also very attentively at that which took place at the office of our friend, *Sidmouth*, author of the memorable circular letter, author of the letter of thanks to the Manchester magistrates, and prime author of so many things which will long live in our remembrance. These things, I mean these conspiracies, do not take me, and they ought not to take my readers, by surprise. I have always foretold that the thing (for by what name I know not to call it) would take *desperate plunges* towards the *close*! I always said that it would lay about it; and that woe be unto him who came near it in its agony. It is now

beset with such terrible dangers; it is immersed in such unfathomable difficulties, that it must either yield up the ghost at once, or make some most outrageously desperate effort to prolong its existence even for a quarter of a year. It is useless to reason with the thing any longer. It is become perfectly mad. It has neither rule for its conduct nor light to guide it. Through the thickest darkness it now and then gets a glimpse; but it is a glimpse like that which some poet describes as being given by the flames of hell to the sinners that are approaching towards the most horrible part of the infernal abodes.

This is a subject upon which one is apt to be tempted to diverge from one's path. I now return and lay before my readers a transcript, or rather reprint, of those proceedings of which I have been speaking, and from which I have detained them too long.

DISCOVERY OF THE MANUFACTURE OF SEDITIOUS AND TREASONABLE PLACARDS.

(From the Times,)

BOW STREET, MONDAY, OCT. 9.

It is already known to the public that a poor and ignorant boy, Adderfield, was on Saturday last brought to this office, charged with circulating handbills of the most treasonable character. The spirit and design of this publication will best appear from its own terms:—

“EVIL BE TO HIM WHO EVIL THINKS.

“The Queen’s friends, whenever, and however assembled, will not content themselves with empty professions, but give solid proofs of their zeal by effectually promoting the subscription for such a service of plate as may be worthy of this noble country; and show her Majesty’s nefarious persecutors that it is not in the power of an infamous government, a corrupt judicature, or bribed majorities—of execrable perjurers, suborners of evidence, or malignant conspirators—to shut the hands of the people of England after they have opened their hearts. Eternal disgrace would be stamped upon the nation if this measure did not thoroughly succeed. Mighty events are probably in the womb of time. Except from the meritless accidents of sex and primogeniture, what claim has the King upon the nation which the Queen does not possess in common with him? She, as well as he, is only third in generation from one King of England; she

is the niece and daughter-in-law of another King; and without preaching any doctrine tending to civil convulsion, the historical truth is undeniable, that England never was greater or happier than in the ‘golden days of good Queen Bess,’ and the glorious ones of Queen Anne. Some among the most remorseless of Queen Caroline’s enemies might bear in mind that there is an express act of parliament which makes it penal to question the right of the nation to limit the succession to the throne. Whilst the wife, with the magnanimity of a Semiramis, is propounding a system that must shortly regenerate this enslaved land, ‘and crush the tyrant while it rends the chain,’ the husband is playing the Dandy. ‘Nero fiddled when Rome was burning.’

“Never will the generous hearts of Englishmen, after the plan has been so promulged of supplying to her Majesty that plate, which, though denied to the niece of George the Third, has been made a boon to her newspaper traducer—never will the public, whose annihilated liberties are sure of resuscitation in the providential instrumentality of this noble-minded Princess (of which, by the way, a recent glorious acquittal even in one of those right arms of tyranny, called courts of law, is auspiciously portentous); never will the British public permit the dishonour to her cause which would be inseparable from failure of the subscription for the plate. Subscriptions

continue to be received at the following places, viz. :—

“Messrs. West, 329, Strand, wire-worker; Parr, Russell-st. Covent-garden, tailor; Ireland, Holborn-bridge, hosier; Cahuac, Blackman-st. Borough, publisher; Dennison, West-Smithfield, cutler; Watling, opposite the Adelphi, Strand, publisher; Whitaker, Surrey Coffee-house, Union-st. Borough; Benbow, 269, Strand, printer; being the original receiving-houses: also by Mrs. Carlile, Fleet-st.; and by all the other subsequently added members of the committee.

“Trustees.—The Duke of Leinster; the Earl of Oxford; Lord William Fitzgerald;

“And the following Members of Parliament and Gentlemen: Sir G. Noel, Sir F. Burdett, Sir R. Wilson, Sir J. Newport, Sir H. Parnell, Hon. D. Kinnauld, Alderman Wood, Peter Moore, Esq., Joseph Hume, Esq., J. C. Hobhouse, Esq., Charles Calvert, Esq., Edward Ellice, Esq., Major I. Williams; Alderman Thorpe, Mr. Sheriff Waithman.

“N. B. All friends to the glorious Revolutions of Spain, Portugal, Naples, Sicily, and to unburlesqued liberty in England, will not fail to attend the Crown and Anchor dinner on the 2d of October. Sir R. Wilson, M. P., K. M. T., T. and S. St. G., St. A., and B. E. in the chair.

“A passing word on the general cause.—Even in their festivities the resisters of the detestable government which enslaves this once free nation should not forget those who are

now suffering for their past well-proved virtues in the cause. Scaffolds have been the melancholy lot of some. Others are languishing in chains and dungeons. A few weeks only, unless the nation be roused in time, will see two more of our foremost champions ‘laid in basest bonds’ by the corrupt judgment of ermined fiends. A long pull, a strong pull, and a pull altogether, may save us all. Let the regenerators of their country discard all petty jealousies, and keep in mind the motto of that brave people which, by a glorious revolution, cast off a tyrant’s sway, and established independence:—*Concordia res parvæ crescunt, discordia maxumæ dilabuntur.*”

When Mr. Minshull, one of the Bow-street magistrates, was proceeding to fine this unfortunate tool in the hands of others, Mr. Pearson proposed to get the person who employed him apprehended. Having sworn that he had traced the fabrication to an individual, and having obtained a warrant to apprehend him, he accompanied Vickery, the officer, to his house, and had him taken into custody on Sunday morning.

This morning (Monday) considerable curiosity appeared to have been excited by the subject, Mr. Hume, M. P., Sir Gerard Noel, M. P., Major Cartwright, and several other gentlemen, came into the office soon after ten o’clock. Sir Robert Baker and Mr. Birnie were the magistrates present; Mr. Minshull soon afterwards took his place. There happened to be but little night

business to require the attention of the Court.

Mr. Pearson—Will your Worship proceed now, then, to inquire into the charge upon which I obtained a warrant on Saturday?

Mr. Birnie—I have no objection: let the person charged be brought in.

It was observed, we believe by one of the officers, that the gentleman was not come.

Sir Robert Baker—He will be here.

Mr. Pearson—I ask you openly whether you have discharged him?

Sir Robert Baker—He has given securities for his appearance, and he will be here; so you may attend another day.

Mr. Pearson—This day was fixed for the purpose, and I wish to know how it is that he is not here?

Sir Robert Baker—He promised to be here at 11. It is now past 11, but he will be here in a few minutes.

Mr. Pearson—Then I shall wait for a few minutes.

After a considerable interval,

Mr. Pearson came forward again, and said—I beg leave to state my charges against a person of the name of Franklin, who was apprehended on Sunday morning by Mr. Vickery and myself. Against this person I have several charges, for fabricating and publishing placards, not only recommending sedition and insurrection, but resistance to the government by force, and for doing all this under the protection and authority of that government. I hold in my hand

many of those treasonable papers, issued by this person at various times. I charge him with being at this moment in treasonable conspiracy in the neighbourhood. I call upon you to grant a warrant for searching the house in which I believe him to be.

Mr. Minshull—Is that the young man that was charged here with circulating seditious placards?

Mr. Pearson—No; he was but the instrument whom Mr. Birnie described as ignorantly giving effect to the purposes of others. I have been five days and five nights in search of the author of the placard and employer of the poor boy. I now ask for an officer to search for this person; and I state boldly that he is engaged in a treasonable conspiracy against the people.

Sir Robert Baker—I understand what treason against the King means; but treason against the people I don't understand.

Mr. Pearson—The King and the Government are understood to represent the people, and to act as their agents.

Sir Robert Baker—Yes; but treason against the people I do not understand.

Mr. Pearson—Well, I charge him with treason against the King.

Mr. Minshull—You charge with treason; the term is sufficiently intelligible.

Mr. Pearson—I charge him with treason; and I say that from this charge he is attempting to run out of the country. I call upon you to use the same means for securing him as you

would against an ignorant, a poor, and a seditious person, in the usual sense attached to the word seditious.

Sir Robert Baker—We have now sent to the man who undertook for his appearance; a very respectable man whom I have long known, and who lives in the neighbouring parish.

Some person reported that he was not there.

Mr. Pearson—I stated other charges against him to you, Mr. Birnie.

Mr. Birnie—Yes, you did, in your letter; and I refused on that account to bail him. I am quite sure he will not appear.

Sir Robert Baker—I know only this; that I discharged him upon the responsibility of a most respectable gentleman who lives in St. Martin's-lane. I have no doubt that he will appear; if he does not, I shall spare no means to apprehend him, not only for this charge, but because he deceived me.

Mr. Minshull—He called on me yesterday; and I have no doubt, if I had been present, I should have done what my brother magistrate did.

Mr. Pearson—Well, I am ready to state my case.

Sir Robert Baker—Would not that be better done in private?

Mr. Pearson—If you please.

Mr. Vickery came forward to justify his activity and fidelity on the occasion.

Mr. Pearson agreed.

Mr. Birnie—Where is old Mr. Williams?

It was answered that he was in attendance.

Sir Robert Baker—Let Mr. Williams come forward.

An old man, of very respectable appearance, came forward to the end of the table.

Sir Robert Baker—Have you seen your friend?

Mr. Williams—I have not to-day.

Sir Robert Baker—Will he be here to-day?

Mr. Williams—Yes, he told me so.

Mr. Birnie—I never expected that he would appear, and therefore I refused to take bail.

Mr. Williams—I have not seen him to-day.

Mr. Birnie—What arrangements did you make?

Mr. Williams—I went this morning to see him, being my next-door neighbour.

Mr. Minshull—When did you see him last?

Mr. Williams.—Yesterday morning we went to No. 6, Berkeley-street, and I called with him at Sir Robert Baker's. We saw Lady Baker, who told us that Sir Robert was probably at your office (Mr. Minshull's.) We came to your office, but, not finding him, we went back again to Sir Robert Baker's.

Mr. Birnie.—But what arrangements had you made for meeting this day?

Mr. Williams.—None.

Mr. Birnie.—When did you part with him?

Mr. Williams.—At 10 o'clock at night, at his house. I came home with him, and dined with him.

Mr. Birnie.—Did he say he was coming here to-day?

Mr. Williams.—He said so in going along.

Mr. Birnie.—In going along? Were you to call on him, or was he to call on you, to come here together?

Mr. Williams.—I was to call on him; and I called at 8 o'clock this morning; but he was not at home.

Mr. Birnie.—Were you surprised? or did you expect to find him?

Mr. Williams.—I did expect to find him.

Mr. Birnie.—I knew Mr. Williams, and I reluctantly refused bail, knowing that Mr. Williams was a respectable man; but I never supposed that the accused meant to appear, and therefore I refused bail. I understood the arrangements to be, then, that he should be here at 12 o'clock, and you, Mr. Williams, with him, ready with bail.

Mr. Pearson.—Mr. Williams, you must be anxious to get him apprehended as well as I. You probably can tell us the names of some of his relations, with whom he may have taken refuge. Is his name *Frankland* or *Franklin*?

Mr. Williams.—*Franklin*.

Mr. Pearson.—What is his Christian name?—*William*.

Mr. Pearson.—Wm. Franklin? He lives in Clarendon-place, Edgware-road.

Mr. Williams.—Yes.

Mr. Pearson.—Has he not a son in the Guards?

Mr. Williams.—He has.

Mr. Pearson.—An officer in the Guards?

Mr. Williams.—Yes, he is an officer.

Mr. Pearson.—What is his Christian name, and where does he live?

Mr. Williams.—In truth I do not know his name, or where he lives.

Mr. Birnie.—Mr. Pearson, you are now stepping too far. All this ought to be private.

Mr. Minshull, Mr. Pearson, and Mr. Williams, retired then to Mr. Stafford's room, where the inquiry was proceeded with. Mr. Stafford returned soon afterwards, and said that Mr. Williams denied having given bail.

Sir Robert Baker.—He certainly gave an undertaking; I don't know whether he considers it bail or not.

Sir Robert Baker soon afterwards retired into Mr. Stafford's room, to assist in the inquiry.

In the private room Mr. Williams's examination was continued, for the purpose of obtaining, if possible, a clue to the discovery of Mr. Franklin's place of concealment. Mr. Williams resolutely persisted in his declaration that he had not in any way bound himself for Mr. Franklin's appearance; but that he had merely assured Sir Robert Baker of the respectability of the accused, and that he would attend with him in the morning at the office. From the examination of Mr. Williams it appeared that Mr. Franklin was a gentleman of independent fortune, and that he had a son an officer in the Guards; he also said that he had been on the Sunday with the officer and the prisoner to Mr. Birnie, at his country house, in order to obtain his liberation; but that Mr. Birnie refused to

comply with his request, and had advised Mr. Williams, as a friend, not to have any thing to do with the prisoner. In defiance, however, of this advice, he went to Sir R. Baker with the prisoner; and that gentleman discharged him out of custody, upon his promising to appear on the next day. At this Mr. Pearson observed that he had received information that Mr. Franklin was, probably, at a house in the neighbourhood; and requested that an officer might be sent with him to search the house. Vickery was appointed to that service. The house in question belongs to a Mr. Dennis O'Bryan; is situated in Craven-street, Strand; and it was represented at the office (we know not with what degree of truth) that that gentleman has, for several years, held a sinecure place under government, worth 800*l.* per annum; and that he is a writer for a certain Morning Paper, which advocates the cause of Ministers.

Information was given at the office that Mr. Franklin had been watched for some days, and had been observed to meet every day, at the house of Mr. Dennis O'Bryan, with some other distinguished characters connected with the ministerial press; and that all the treasonable and seditious hand-bills are carried to that house, and the conspirators admitted by a signal given of drawing a stick along the railing. When Mr. Pearson and Vickery arrived at Craven-street, they were refused admittance by the servant, when Vickery threatened to get

in at the window. At length a gentleman from within, who appeared not to like the aspect of affairs, came out; and the officer took advantage of the door being opened to enter the house, followed by Mr. Pearson. Mr. Dennis O'Bryan soon made his appearance, and declared most vehemently that he did not even know Mr. Franklin, although Mr. Franklin had been traced into Mr. O'Bryan's house constantly during the last three years, and although Mr. Williams, upon his examination, admitted that he had met the aforesaid Mr. Dennis O'Bryan at this unknown Mr. Franklin's house.

The search of Mr. O'Bryan's house was unsuccessful, and Mr. Pearson returned to the office. During his absence Mr. Haydon contrived to draw some very important facts from Mr. Williams. He admitted that on the Sunday night, so late as 10 o'clock, Mr. Franklin told him that he meant to go out of town, and that that morning, at 8 o'clock, Mr. Franklin's daughter had told him that before 12 o'clock her father would be above one hundred miles from London.

Mr. Minshull remarked, that it was very singular that not until three o'clock could this gentleman recollect a circumstance so important to the inquiry; and that he should have thought an honourable man would not have rested until he had disclosed those facts to Sir Robert Baker, in order that warrants might have been issued early in the morning for

his apprehension. We understand that warrants for the apprehension of the accused are sent off to different parts of the country.

Mr. Pearson, attended by Mr. Haydon, Mr. Wilson, and two other gentlemen, then went to the Secretary of State's office, and had an interview with Mr. Clive, who, very much to the astonishment of the party, had received intelligence of all that had transpired, and was as well acquainted with the mysterious escape of the accused, and all the minutæ of the case, as were the gentlemen themselves. He further laboured to justify the conduct of Sir Robert Baker, by saying that the charge was only that of a misdemeanour, and that therefore he might let him out at his discretion.—Mr. Pearson, in very warm terms, replied to this assertion, that a magistrate possessed no such right; but that, whatever might be the rank, family, connexions, or political feelings of a person accused, a magistrate had no power to order his discharge without taking good and sufficient bail for his appearance. With great energy to Mr. Clive, he told him, that he begged he would expressly understand him, that, in the presence of the gentlemen then in the room, he invited the aid of the Home Department to secure the apprehension of the accused; that, as the Secretary of State was in the habit of offering rewards, and issuing proclamations, for the arrest of offenders of comparatively minor importance, he earnestly

entreated of him, that very day, to take measures for the apprehension of this daring offender.

Mr. Pearson further remarked, that, considering the individual in question stood charged with having published seditious and treasonable placards, and, with considerable expence and trouble, distributed them gratuitously by hundreds of thousands for a period of three years, extending over times in which public distress had driven the lower orders to a state of irritation, amounting almost to madness: considering the feverish state of public feeling at this moment, when these atrocious placards were being issued forth; considering that he had ordered 50,000 copies to be printed, and had actually bespoken a hand-bill, calling upon the people to arm themselves, and to resist the constitutional authorities; considering also, that the accused had been suffered to escape through the extraordinary, mysterious, and unprecedented conduct of their own magistrate, Sir Robert Baker; that, if the Home Department did not use extraordinary exertions to retrieve the error of their own officer, and to deliver up this man to answer to the offended laws of his country, there would not be wanting people to suppose that the rank and occupation of the man had secured his safety; and indeed, the world would draw conclusions too obvious to need to be specified.

Mr. Clive said, that Lord Sidmouth was not then at the office; but that, if Mr. Pearson would

call another day, he would receive an answer to his application.

Mr. Pearson replied, that, as he believed the accused would quit the country, it was that night, and that night only, that the services of his lordship would be of any use; and that, therefore, he would call again if such were Mr. Clive's pleasure; but he could not leave the neighbourhood without receiving a decisive answer.

Mr. Pearson left with Mr. Clive two of the seditious hand-bills, and was appointed to call again at half-past four o'clock, at which time that gentleman and his friends returned, and Mr. Clive, addressing them, said, that Lord Sidmouth did not see any thing in the hand-bills to justify his interference. It should be remembered that the two bills left were the one which we have before copied, and another, containing, among other seditious and inflammatory expressions, the following, alluding to the execution at Derby:—"Strike not at all, or strike home; think of our personal insupportable servitude; and always remember that the alternative is liberty, or a glorious grave."

Mr. Pearson replied, that if such were Lord Sidmouth's answer, and for such reasons, he had drawn his conclusions from insufficient premises. Say that he rested his claim to Lord Sidmouth's interference, not relying upon those placards, infamous and treasonable as they were, but also upon the 18 others, all of which had been circulated during the last three

years. Mr. Clive said distinctly that he had stated this to Lord Sidmouth, who had replied that he saw no occasion for the interference of the department over which he presided; and therefore, Mr. Pearson and his friends made their bow, and retired.

Late last evening Mr. Minshull announced to Mr. Pearson, at Bow-street, that, finding the tale of Adderfield to be true, and that he had been made the dupe of the designs of others, he (Mr. Minshull) had shown compassion to him, and had *only* fined him 5*l.* and sentenced him to hard labour in the house of correction for three months.

It will be recollected that Adderfield could not read, and was, therefore, ignorant of the contents of the hand-bill which he was the mere instrument of circulating: meanwhile the *author* of the bill has been suffered to escape without remark.

To the Editor of the Times.

SIR,—I shall proceed, with all possible brevity, and without any preface, to correct the falsehoods contained in your Bow-street account of Monday last, regarding myself.

1st. It is false that I held, or hold, a *sinecure* place under the present government. The only office which I possess is a colonial appointment, conferred upon me more than 14 years since by Lord Grey (when his lordship was First Lord of the Admiralty), at the instance of Mr. Fox.

2d. It is false that I am a writer for a certain Morning Paper. Were I such, I should

not offer apology or explanation for such a disposition of myself. The fact, however, is, that although in the course of my life, and still an occasional correspondent of several papers (*The Times* and *Chronicle* included) like thousands of others, I never had either property, management, engagement, employment, or concern in any newspaper, since the hour of my birth.

3d. It is false that distinguished characters connected with the ministerial press are in habits of meeting at my house. Upon the most accurate retrospect of which my memory is capable, I do not recollect any gentleman now connected with any possible paper to have been inside my threshold for the last twelve months. Such an incident may have occurred, as there are gentlemen in that line of vocation whom I know and highly esteem; but I have not the slightest remembrance of such a visitor for a full year past.

4th. That Pearson and Vickery were refused admittance by the servant happens to be a fact, though found in the said statement; but the complexion given to that refusal is as false as the three first heads. The truth is, that I am very much annoyed by applicants, in real or pretended want; and that I have, during my 42 years' residence in this street, been obliged, perhaps 42 scores of times, to threaten my servants with dismissal, on the score of receiving begging letters, and admitting strangers. It is to the discipline thence arising, coupled with seeking for a name unknown to those ser-

vants as a male visitant, that they refused to open the door. The instant that I, who was getting out of bed, learned the name and object of Vickery, every part of the house was immediately submitted to his research. I shall not add another word.

DENIS O'BRYEN.

21, Craven-street, Oct. 11, 1820.

WARWICKSHIRE MILITIA.

I have not room in the present Register to notice some information about *Cherry*, the Local Militia Adjutant at Coventry. I find, but with no great surprise, that the Warwickshire Militia, before their dispersion, were signing an address to the Queen; and that great part of them had actually signed it; but that it was wheedled out of their hands and kept from them till after the day of dispersion. This shows what endeavours are making to stifle the voices of the people; and it also shows the fears of the persons making use of those endeavours. Exactly how this struggle is to terminate nobody can say; but the *thing* has received a blow which it will never recover; and the beauty of it is, the blow has been given by itself.

HER MAJESTY'S ANSWERS TO ADDRESSES.

ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS FROM THE BOROUGH OF BOSTON:

I gratefully accept the congratulations and the condolence of the Householders and Inhabitants of the Borough of Boston.

My life furnishes a singular instance of the manner in which injustice and cruelty have been formed into a systematic conspiracy, and prosecuted for nearly a quarter of a century against an individual of my exalted rank. This conspiracy has shown itself at different periods, in a diversity of machinations; in plots, upon a grand scale and upon a small; in the bold asseverations of unblushing perjury, and in the minute ramifications of clandestine fraud; in open enmities, and insidious friendships;—and all this secretly directed by individual influence, and instigated by individual malignity. Thus nearly one half of my existence has been passed amidst the wiles of treachery. My confidence has been sought only to be betrayed: the mask of regard has been worn only the more easily to deceive. The very men, who are now my accusers, were formerly my declared advocates, and my professedly zealous friends. The majority of the present witnesses, who have been marshalled against me, like an armed host, and regularly trained to be expert in circumstantial falsehood and methodized perjury, were rescued by my bounty

from penury and wretchedness. But they seem to have been warmed into life, only like vipers, to bite the hand by which they were cherished in adversity.

My regard for those rights of the people, and those liberties of the nation, which my ancestors were invited to defend, makes me more deeply grieve to see both so vitally impugned in my person, and so essentially violated in the Bill of Pains and Penalties. I would rather have perished in defence of those rights and liberties, than that they should receive a fatal stab by a measure which cannot degrade the Queen without enslaving the people.

As the first subject in the realm, I feel the rights of all other subjects identified with my own; and as I am placed in immediate contact with the Throne, I cannot but be alarmed for its security, when I see it likely to be deprived of its only solid support; the respect and the affections of the people.

After having encountered so many storms in the former period of my life, I am anxious that the remainder of my days should be a period of repose, in which the wicked may cease to trouble, and the treacherous to ensnare; when I may enjoy that tranquillity to which I have long been a stranger, and practise that beneficence which has always been my delight.

ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS FROM LIVERPOOL.

I am much gratified by finding that my conduct is approved,

while my rights are vindicated, and my sufferings lamented by the inhabitants of the enlightened town of Liverpool and its vicinity.

My accession to the high dignity of Queen Consort of these realms, was hailed by the nation with vivid expressions of joy; though that joy has been mingled with grief, by the indignities which I have since experienced, and the persecution of which I have so long been the object.

When it pleased the will of my Royal Consort to dismiss me from his Royal abode, he was not able to fix the slightest imputation of moral blame on my conduct; and could only excuse his own by alleging that his inclinations were not under his controul. In this state of total and unprovoked desertion by him who had recently sworn eternal fidelity only to myself, I had no solace left but in the company of my only child; and it is well known that that solace was gradually diminished, till it was entirely taken away.

Those who are now my accusers, were once professedly my friends; though they were never, even in profession, the friends of the people. They are now the declared enemies of both; and, indeed, they are the enemies of all who are not the friends of corruption in every branch of the public Administration. To incur their hatred nothing more is requisite than not to acquiesce in injustice and not to countenance iniquity. If I would have truckled to their selfishness, they would have ce-

lebrated my baseness in poems of panegyric. But the reality of incorruptible independence is such an alien from their habits, and such a stranger to their minds, that they turned aghast at the sight, like the guilty King at the apparition of his murdered guest!

To be the hatred of such men is to be entitled to the love of mankind. To be the shaft of their malice is to be conspicuous for worth and eminent for integrity. To be assailed by their slanders and persecuted by their rancour, it is only necessary to be the steady friend of all that is true, all that is just, all that is honourable, all that is praiseworthy among men; of all that promotes the real good, and exalts the true glory of the People.

The former ordeals through which I passed, without the smallest imputation of criminality, though they were not conducted with candour, were less characterised by malignity than the present. The present is marked by an intensity of malevolence, of which, happily for the honour of our species, only one example is furnished in the history of mankind.

ANSWER TO THE WARD OF CRIPPLE-GATE WITHOUT.

The Citizens of London have never deserted their post when tyranny attacked the rights of individuals, or threatened the constitutional liberties of the nation. In this critical period, when both individual right and general liberty are vitally assailed in the person of the

Queen, I have found in the Citizens of London my most intrepid supporters and my most zealous friends; and among the foremost of those supporters and friends, the grateful feelings of my heart tell me that I ought ever to number the householders and inhabitants of the Ward of Cripplegate-without.

Unlimited power ought to be given to no man, unless it could at the same time be united with unlimited wisdom; but as Providence does not usually bestow a much larger portion of wisdom or of virtue upon kings, than upon other individuals, it is necessary that their power should be circumscribed within strict limitations, in order to render it beneficial to mankind.

The power of the laws is good, because it is power without passion; but who would approve discretionary power, in an individual who is the slave of his appetites, or remarkable only for his fatuity? Where power is limited by fixed laws for the common good, those laws which may be called fundamental, cannot be changed without the consent of the people, for whose good they were established. A limited monarchy, with fundamental laws which may be capriciously changed, is, in fact, an arbitrary Government. It is not the Government of unimpassioned law, but of fickle inclination.

The Bill of Pains and Penalties, which is pending against me, is an anomaly in a free Government. It is an assumption of power without limitations;

it is a domination that spurns all controul: it begins with setting aside every existing law which has any reference to the protection of the individual against those Pains and Penalties which the Bill proposes to inflict.

If, therefore, such a Bill of Pains and Penalties should pass, it may, perhaps, hereafter be proposed to the people of England to consider how far it ought to be obeyed. It can have no claim to obedience, as an act emanating from legitimate authority; for no authority is any further legitimate, than as it is exercised within those fixed constitutional limitations, by which it was originally circumscribed, and for the good of the people, for whose good alone it was bestowed. In a limited Monarchy all power must be a trust; but the very nature of a trust supposes an accountableness to some higher authority, for otherwise a trust might be changed at the pleasure of the trustee.

If it be said that the enactment of a Bill of Pains and Penalties is only the exercise of a constitutional power, I answer, that no unconstitutional power can be constitutionally exercised. How can a breach of the law be conformity to law?

Though, therefore, this Bill of Pains and Penalties should be solemnly enacted, it may not be the less an unconstitutional act. Perhaps it will be said, "What then, cannot Kings, Lords, and Commons, do as they please?" I answer, No.

Their power is only a trust, limited by law; and what is a trust, never can suppose unrestrained volition or arbitrary agency.

If the power of Kings, Lords, and Commons, is limited by the fundamental laws of the realm, their acts are not binding when they exceed those limitations. If it be asked, "What then, are Kings, Lords, and Commons amenable to any higher authority?"---I distinctly answer, Yes. To what higher authority?---To that of God and of the People.

ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS FROM
NORTHAMPTON.

I set a high value on the many testimonies of regard which I have received from the Mercantile and Manufacturing part of the community. Among those estimable claims upon my gratitude, I shall always rank this Address from the Tradesmen and Mechanics of the Town of Northampton.

Good and evil, happiness and misery, life and death, are the appointments of God. What his goodness freely gives, I feel that the same goodness may as freely take away. As a being made highly susceptible of affection, and with nerves alive to the slightest impressions of pleasure or of pain, I cannot but lament over the departure of those who so long had a hold upon my heart—whose joys and sorrows were always in unison with my own; but as far as human infirmity will permit, I

endeavour to repress the falling tear, and to stop the involuntary sigh. I bind my will to that truly PARENTAL POWER, whose decrees have always a reference to the good of the heart which they oppress, and to the improvement of the mind which they agonize. I saw my only child cut off by the rude gust of adversity, like a flower in the early spring. Here my affection received a wound, which has never been entirely closed, and which the fond intrusions of memory will not suffer to disappear. Here I felt a disposition to be querulous, and a tendency to be sceptical; but I remembered that life is only a transient discipline for a more lasting existence, and that though man is short-sighted, the UNIVERSAL FATHER must be good. Who is there that can look back upon his past life, and say, that he has not been better for the experience of adversity?

I cannot have the smallest doubt but that the tradesmen and mechanics of Northampton feel the most zealous regard for the House of Brunswick, and for the principles of that limited Monarchy which it is their duty to defend. If those principles have been outraged by any late measures, I hope to live to see the ancient oak of British Liberty send forth new and more healthy shoots, and spread its branches far and wide, till it alike covers the high and the low, the rich and the poor, under the ample canopy of its protecting shade.

ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS FROM THE
INHABITANTS OF WHITECHAPEL.

I am happy to find that my many sufferings and my accumulated wrongs have so powerfully interested the sympathies of the Inhabitants of St. Mary, Whitechapel.

The conspiracy which I am combating, though nominally directed against myself, is, in fact, a conspiracy against British Liberty. No measure since the Revolution has portended such disastrous consequences as the present Bill of Pains and Penalties. While it threatens freedom under all its diversified aspects, and with all its general rights, and all its particular securities, it at the same time darkens the perspective of the future with a lowering appearance of civil war. It exhibits a cloud at the edge of the political horizon that may burst in misery on every family in the country. This Bill of Pains and Penalties may thus be the harbinger of woe to every man's hearth. It may imbitter the days of thousands and tens of thousands, both of rich and poor; and produce in all irremediable regrets. After the noble stand which so many of the most estimable among the Peers have made against this pestiferous Bill, and the total want of any evidence to justify its enactment, it cannot be expected that it will pass; but, if it should pass, we must never lose sight of the probability that his Majesty may marry again. The issue of that marriage would, in all likelihood, cause a contested succession. That part of the

nation which will not allow the Bill of Pains and Penalties to be a constitutional act, may not readily submit to the offspring of a marriage which will never, generally, be deemed legitimate.

If my marriage be annulled, it must be annulled in defiance of all law. The Queen, therefore, who succeeded me would only be nominally Queen; for no lawful right can be conveyed by an illegal act; and, in the opinion of the great majority of the nation, nothing can invest this Bill of Pains and Penalties with any legal characteristics. It will never be regarded as any thing more than an act of pure tyranny; and, as such, it will excite the hatred of the present age, and experience the execrations of posterity.

ANSWER TO AN ADDRESS FROM THE
INHABITANTS OF THE WARD OF
ALDERSGATE.

I have recently received the most unequivocal proofs of affectionate attachment, on the part of the citizens of London. The present Address, from the Inhabitants of the Ward of Aldersgate, is an addition to the many claims which the first metropolis in the world has upon my gratitude. Great as have been my afflictions, and many as have been my wrongs, they have both experienced no small degree of alleviation from the general expression of public sympathy that has been so vividly manifested since my return.

The sentiment of indignation, which the proceedings of my

enemies have excited, has not been limited in its extent, or restricted in its operations. It has been diffused over the whole country: every heart has vibrated with the feeling; and it has showed the potency of its influence in every circle of society.

It is not a mere party feeling, and, therefore, is not likely to be fugitive and evanescent. It is a feeling which attaches itself to a question of universal interest, for it involves the interest of national liberty. If it were purely my own rights that were affected by the pending Bill of Pains and Penalties, I should feel more indifferent than I now do about the present procedure in the House of Lords; but as the rights of every Englishman must be impaired by such violation of constitutional liberty, I am more impressed by the tremendous consequences with which it threatens the

public-welfare than by any loss or privation which it may bring upon myself.

If my rights as Queen Consort should be transferred to another, that transfer would be against the fundamental laws of the realm, and, wanting the highest of all sanctions, the general consent of the nation, would receive no other obedience than that which force might impose.

In these enlightened times whatever the panders to the arbitrary will of Sovereigns may pretend, no throne can be secure that is not established in the affections of the people. No other power can possess anything like permanence or solidity. All besides this is mere gaudy pageantry or unsubstantial show; it may remain for a time; but it will suddenly disappear, like a vision of the night.

Printed and Published by W. B. BARNES, 269, Strand,

and Price Sixpence Halfpenny in the Country.